

**CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP**

2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1801

(202) 974-1500

FACSIMILE  
(202) 974-1999

WWW.CLEARYGOTTLIEB.COM

MARK LEDDY  
GEORGE S. CARY  
MITCHELL S. DUPLER  
GIOVANNI P. PREZIOSO  
MICHAEL H. KRIMMINGER  
MATTHEW D. SLATER  
MICHAEL A. MAZZUCHI  
ROBERT W. COOK  
MARK W. NELSON  
ROBIN M. BERGON  
DEREK M. BUSH  
BRIAN BYRNE  
PAUL D. MARQUARDT  
JEREMY CALSYN  
LEAH BRANNON  
KATHERINE MOONEY CARROLL  
PAUL R. ST. LAWRENCE  
RESIDENT PARTNERS

KENNETH L. BACHMAN, JR.  
DANIEL B. SILVER  
RICHARD DEC. HINDS  
SARA D. SCHOTLAND  
WILLIAM B. MCGURN III  
JOHN S. MAGNEY  
JANET L. WELLER  
LINDA J. SOLDO  
SENIOR COUNSEL

W. RICHARD BIDSTRUP  
STEVEN J. KAISER  
JOYCE E. MCCARTY  
KATHLEEN W. BRADISH  
COUNSEL

KAREN A. KERR  
JOHN P. MCGILL, JR.  
THOMAS I. HAI  
LARRY WORK-DEMBOWSKI  
MEGHAN A. IRLER  
SENIOR ATTORNEYS

NOWELL BAMBERGER  
ELSBETH BENNETT  
GRANT A. BERMAN\*  
KEVIN BIRNEY\*  
JACOB BOYARS  
NATHAN S. BROWNBACK\*  
STEVEN W. CHURCH\*  
ETHAN CRAIG  
SARAH CRANDALL  
DANIEL CULLEY  
REGINALD CUYLER JR.\*  
MATTHEW A. DAIGLER  
LISA M. DANZIG  
RYAN M. DAVIS  
JOANNA MARIA EL KHOURY\*  
TABITHA EDGENS\*  
ELAINE EWING  
BRANDON J. FIGG\*  
ERIN FRAKE  
PATRICK FULLER  
JOSHUA B. GARDNER\*  
MICHAEL D. GENDALL\*  
MELISSA L. GOHLKE  
JEFFREY AARON HALL  
CARRIE ELIZABETH HANSON  
EILEEN HO\*  
JAMES HUNSBERGER  
PHILLIP L. HURST\*  
BRADLEY JUSTUS  
ANNA KARASS  
THOMAS KELLY  
ANDREW L. KLINE  
ZUZANNA KNYPINSKI  
ALBERT LAI  
ALEXIS R.B. LAZDA\*  
JOANNA R. LAMPE  
CHINYELU K. LEE  
MEREDITH LEIGH MANN  
BENJAMIN A. LEVIN  
KATHERINE LEVINE  
MACEY LEVINGTON  
JENNIFER X. LUO

CARL L. MALM  
FARRELL MALONE  
MATTHEW A. MCGUIRE  
ROBERT A. MCNAMEE  
BENJAMIN MEES  
DAN MIFFLIN  
KARI E. MILLIGAN  
MORGAN L. MULVENON  
CHRISTINE MUNDIA  
TANYA TAUBMAN O'NEIL  
SAMUEL PARK\*  
JENNIFER E. PAUL  
DANIEL PEREZ\*  
AMBER V. PHILLIPS\*  
KENNETH S. REINKER  
HAKHEEM RIZK  
GREGORY T.W. ROSENBERG  
AARON S. ROSS\*  
ANDRES SAENZ\*  
ALYSSA C. SCRUGGS  
OMAR SERAGELDIN  
SAIF SHAH MOHAMMED  
ZACK SMITH\*  
LAUREN E. SNYDER  
CAROLINE STANTON  
CHARLES STERLING  
RYAN SUGG\*  
TARA LYNN TAVERNIA  
TEALE TOWELL  
KELLY ERIN WADE\*  
ASHLEY WALKER  
ERIK WITTMAN  
ASSOCIATES

\* ADMITTED ONLY TO A BAR OTHER THAN THAT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
WORKING UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF PRINCIPALS OF THE WASHINGTON OFFICE.

NEW YORK	ROME
PARIS	MILAN
BRUSSELS	HONG KONG
LONDON	BEIJING
FRANKFURT	BUENOS AIRES
COLOGNE	SÃO PAULO
MOSCOW	ABU DHABI
	SEOUL

Writer's Direct Dial: +1 (202) 974-1920  
E-Mail: gcary@cgsh.com

July 8, 2015

**VIA ECF**

Hon. Vernon S. Broderick, U.S.D.J.  
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse  
40 Foley Square, Room 415  
New York, NY 10007

Re: *In re: Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 2542;  
Response to Notices of Supplemental Authority filed by IPPs and TreeHouse

Dear Judge Broderick:

We write regarding the Notices of Supplemental Authority submitted by Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs ("IPPs") and Plaintiff TreeHouse Foods, Inc. (TreeHouse), ECF Nos. 282, 284, just three days before oral argument on Keurig's Motions to Dismiss.

The case identified by IPPs, *McWane, Inc. v. F.T.C.*, 783 F.3d 814 (11th Cir. 2015), was decided nearly three months ago. IPPs argue that the decision is notable because the court rejected one of McWane's arguments regarding monopoly power. But this is irrelevant here, where Keurig lacks monopoly power in brewers in light of the allegations that it *prices brewers at or below cost in order to compete*, and where plaintiffs have not made allegations sufficient to meet the test for monopoly power in a purported aftermarket. Keurig Mem. of Law ISO Mot. to Dismiss, ECF No. 231, at 18, 20-21. *McWane*, in contrast, did not involve an aftermarket product or allegations of at or below cost pricing.

As for TreeHouse's 1,300 word letter, it introduces new arguments based on cases decided before its brief was filed, and is an unauthorized sur-reply filed on the eve of argument. *See* Individual Rule 4.B ("Sur-reply memoranda will not be accepted without prior permission of the Court."). TreeHouse's letter also identifies no new relevant law.

Hon. Vernon S. Broderick

Page 2 of 2

In *U.S. v. Apple, Inc.*, --- F.3d ----, 2015 WL 3953243 (2d Cir. 2015), the Second Circuit noted the well-established rule that a hub-and-spoke conspiracy requires agreements among the spokes. *Id.* at \*17. The Second Circuit affirmed the finding of agreements in light of, *inter alia*, “near-simultaneous signing” of the agreements at issue and “constant communication” among the publisher spokes. *Id.* at \*21. As noted in our reply brief discussing these same points in the district court’s opinion, neither circumstance is alleged here. Keurig Reply Mem. of Law ISO Mot. to Dismiss, ECF No. 264, at 8. There is no plausible allegation of communication between, for example, Emeril’s and Cinnabon, and the trademark licensing agreements at issue here are alleged to have been signed over the span of *nearly a decade*. *Id.*

*Kimble v. Marvel Entertainment*, --- S. Ct. ----, 2015 WL 2473380 (June 22, 2015), also establishes no new law. “The sole question presented” in *Kimble* was whether to overrule *Brulotte v. Thys Co.*, 379 U.S. 29 (1964), which the Supreme Court declined to do. *Kimble*, 2015 WL 2473380 at \*3. Nor is the *Brulotte* patent licensing rule relevant here in any event, as evidenced by (among other things) the fact that TreeHouse’s prior briefing did not cite it and there are no allegations of unlawful patent licensing in the TreeHouse complaint.

TreeHouse’s final case, *People of the State of New York v. Actavis plc*, No. 14-4624, 2015 WL 3405461 (2d Cir. May 22, 2015), was decided six weeks ago, was already brought to this Court’s attention (ECF No. 276), and reiterates that the key issue in an antitrust challenge to product design is whether the defendant has coerced consumers, which Keurig has not done. Indeed, plaintiffs affirmatively allege that Keurig’s portion packs continue to be compatible with 1.0 brewers, such that no consumer is forced to buy a new brewer. *Actavis*, 2015 WL 3405461, at \*9 (citing *Berkey Photo, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*, 603 F.2d 263 (2d Cir. 1979)).

TreeHouse also uses *Actavis* as a springboard to discuss *In re Suboxone Antitrust Litigation*, 64 F. Supp. 2d 665 (E.D. Pa. 2014), a 2014 case nowhere in the record, and to offer freestanding discussion of *United States v. Microsoft*, 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001) and *Berkey Photo, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*, 603 F.2d 263 (2d Cir. 1979), both already cited in its briefing. These new arguments do not show the coercion required to sustain a product design claim under *Berkey* and *Actavis*. *In re Suboxone* involved a forced switch like the Second Circuit found unlawful in *Actavis* and that is not present here. 64 F. Supp. 2d. at 681. And TreeHouse now cites *Microsoft* in an unavailing attempt to use faulty exclusive dealing allegations to shore up a faulty product design claim. But there is no basis for arguing that Keurig’s contracts with distributors (who are never alleged to carry even a single 2.0 brewer) show that the 2.0’s *design* coerces consumers. Finally, the *Berkey Photo* language regarding intent that TreeHouse now cites addressed Kodak’s restriction of its new *film* to its new camera. *See Berkey Photo*, 603 F.2d at 288. Here, Keurig’s portion packs are backwards compatible with 1.0 brewers manufactured by Keurig and others, and therefore cannot constitute “coercion.”

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ George S. Cary

George S. Cary

cc: Counsel of record (via ECF)